THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

)L. LII. No. 344 FEBRUARY, 1949

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Editorial

The Theory of Supplemental Ordination - - - - - - *H. E. W. Turner*

The Philosophy of Christian Existence - - - - - - - *Erich Müller*

The Unjust Steward - - - - - - *John Coutts*

Richard Baxter's *The Reformed Pastor* - - *Thomas Wood*

For full list of contents see within.

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at Windsor Castle, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

. per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

the U.S.A. $3.60 payable to the Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N.Y.

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, D.D., 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks. (MSS should not exceed 3,500 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)

Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2.

Advisory Committee

Montgomery Belgion
The Rev. Frank Bennett
The Rev. L. J. Collins
The Rev. W. W. S. March
The Rev. Prof. E. C. Ratcliff
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.

Editorial Representative in the U.S.A.: The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Editorial		41
The Theory of Supplemental Ordination	*H. E. W. Turner*	44
The Philosophy of Christian Existence	*Erich Müller*	50
Studies in Texts: The Unjust Steward	*John Coutts*	54
Why You Should Read It — XV. Richard Baxter's *The Reformed Pastor*	*Thomas Wood*	60
Correspondence:		
The Ministry	*Norman Sykes*	67
The Distribution of Assistant Curates	*A Deacon and G. Birchenough*	68
Book Reviews:		
W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*	*J. G. Davies*	70
G. A. Michell, *Eucharistic Consecration in the Primitive Church*	*A. H. Couratin*	71
M. Jarrett-Kerr, C.R., *Our Trespasses;* F. W. Dillistone, *Revelation and Evangelism*	*E. S. Urwin*	73
Charles Williams, *Seed of Adam and Other Plays; Arthurian Torso*	*Montgomery Belgion*	74
Nathaniel Micklem, *Religion*	*D. W. Gundry*	75
F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*	*George Every, S.S.M.*	77
J. Staudinger, S.J., *Das Schöne als Weltanschauung*	*R. Gregor Smith*	78
C. M. Ady, *The Rôle of Women in the Church*	*Marianne Turner*	79
Books Received		80

THEOLOGY

VOL. LII FEBRUARY, 1949 No. 344

Editorial

WE had intended by now to have read in their entirety the four volumes on *Man's Disorder and God's Design,* which were written in preparation for the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam. Many of our readers will no doubt be able to sympathize with the causes of our failure to accomplish this purpose. The turmoil of moving from Hawarden to Windsor, and of setting up house under conditions that we are told, and indeed hope, are exceptionally adverse, has left us with insufficient time or ease of mind. We have, however, read enough to justify a confident recommendation of the volumes for careful study. Their several titles are: *The Universal Church in God's Design, The Church's Witness to God's Design, The Church and the Disorder of Society,* and *The Church and the International Disorder.* They are published by the S.C.M. Press at 42s. for the set or at 12s. 6d. for each volume.

Many who attended the Amsterdam Conference have said that it was an exciting experience to meet in one place and at one time most of the best-known living theologians of the non-Roman Churches. That experience has been denied to the rest of us. But in these volumes we have an opportunity of reading essays by the same galaxy of divines. Nor are their essays the unrelated contributions of individuals to a vast improvised symposium. They are the outcome of a carefully co-ordinated plan of ecumenical study, and in most cases the essays had been stringently criticized, discussed, and revised before they were finally presented for publication.

It will be interesting to discover the lines both of their agreement and of their disagreement. It will be no surprise to find that these lines do not correspond to denominational lines. One broad and important cleavage, or alleged cleavage, has already been advertised in a lively manner in the Supplement which Dr Reinhold Niebuhr contributed to the *Christian News-Letter* on October 27th, 1948, entitled "We are Men and not God." On December 8th Dr Karl Barth wrote "A Preliminary Reply to Dr Reinhold Niebuhr" in the same periodical.

Niebuhr says that at Amsterdam "the most marked theological difference apparent . . . was between what was frequently described as 'the continental theology' and what was with equal inaccuracy known as the 'Anglo-Saxon approach to theology.'" These designations (it is admitted on both sides) are misleading, since no one suggests that the difference is a geographical one, except in a rough sense. Niebuhr remarks that the emphasis of the first position, of which he takes Barth as the representative, is on the assurance that,

since "Jesus Christ has already robbed sin, death, the devil, and hell of their power and has already vindicated divine and human justice in His person, . . . the care of the Church and the care of the world is not our care."

It need hardly be said that Niebuhr does not quarrel with the premise, but he asks whether the conclusion follows, or ought to follow, and whether it is in accord with the teaching of Scripture. It seems to him that Barth's emphasis encourages, and in fact endorses, an irresponsible attitude to "the trials and perplexities, the judgments and discriminations, which Christians face in the daily round of their individual and collective life." He admits that Barth's teaching inspired during the Nazi period much heroic resistance to tyranny, but when and where tyranny is not enthroned what guidance, he asks, is given by this teaching to a Christian statesman in his day-to-day responsibilities? Under a godless tyranny the Church may have to become an ark on which to survive a flood, but is this to be henceforth its characteristic or permanent office?

Moreover, the effect of this emphasis is to inhibit the task of the evangelist. He cannot meet unbelieving men and reason with them, where they are. All he can say to them is that Jesus Christ died and rose again for them. If they can see no sense in this, he can but wait until they receive the gift of faith.

Barth, in his "preliminary reply," disowns Niebuhr's interpretation of his position, which he regards as a caricature. As regards Barth himself, we can well believe that this is so. Nevertheless, Niebuhr has spoken a word in season. He has called attention to an undoubted tendency in the theological world. It would certainly be unjust to label this tendency "Barthian," a word which in any case ought to be expunged from the theological vocabulary; it must be more objectionable to Barth himself than to anyone. In this matter at any rate, if he were able to make his meaning clear, it is quite likely that he would be found to be one of the most powerful correctors of the tendency we have in mind.

We mean the tendency to withdraw from concern with the welfare of all men, with their political, economic, and cultural life, on the ground that civilization is doomed and anyhow society as a whole is "pagan," and to concentrate on the inner life of the Church, conceived in terms of realized eschatology. It is supposed that the position of the Church today is closely parallel to that of the Church in the apostolic age, that of a small minority in an infidel society. Even if the parallel were much closer than it is, the inferences drawn from it would not hold good. We do not deny that there are countries and particular churches where the parallel at first sight looks close. But England is not at present one of these countries, and we do not believe that the Gospel calls us to withdraw from social and political responsibility as long as the way to its exercise remains open.

The error arises perhaps from asking first whether men are believers or not. Whereas the first question is: What is God's concern with this people and what is His calling to this people, even if at

present only a minority openly confesses Him? In England the time has not come to retreat into an ecclesiastical stronghold; it is by no means clear that there is one into which we could retreat. It is a time when believers should go forth and bear witness to God's sovereignty over the whole of our nation and His claim upon every area of our national life. Seeking to meet men where they are, and confident that God is in communication with them whatever may be the case with the organized Church, Christians are called to prove their faith in the open world where the events of this time press their peculiar fears and doubts and strains upon all. The Gospel, rightly understood, does not drive unbelievers to a fruitless despair, or pronounce upon them a hopeless doom. It speaks to them of a universal Deliverer and it calls them to repentance. It is Christians who are themselves learning to repent of the limits that they have set to God's delivering love and power who will be able to help others to a like repentance.

The question posed by Niebuhr is far from being one that is ripe for debate only among ecumenical theologians, or that strikes only at the teaching of certain "continental" divines. This discussion should not be allowed to degenerate into a dispute whether Niebuhr has or has not misrepresented the message of Karl Barth. Whatever theologians say or do not say, God is calling us to responsible obedience in every area of our national life, not least in those areas where His Holy Name is not openly or consciously acknowledged, and not least among men who misunderstand the Gospel because of our own distortion of it.

* * * * *

An excellent popular account of the Amsterdam Conference, accompanied by questions for group discussion, has been written by Mr H. G. G. Herklots, entitled *Amsterdam, 1948* (S.C.M. Press, 2s. 6d.). There has also now been published *The Message and Reports of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, with aids to study and discussion* (S.C.M. Press, 3s.). The fact that the ecumenical movement has hitherto been to a large extent a head without a body is often deplored. If what happened at Amsterdam can be "got across" to the congregations in the parishes, this state of affairs will begin to be remedied. These two little books explain vividly and in short compass what it is all about.

The Theory of Supplemental Ordination

THE Report of the Lambeth Conference for 1948 on the Unity of the Church contains as an Appendix to Part II (pp. 65-6) two memoranda on this subject. They do not form part of the report itself, but are printed merely as documents of interest. The Lambeth Fathers do not identify themselves with the theological point of view contained in either, but "have been content to state them both, side by side and unreconciled, in the belief that further consideration and study will need to be given to the subject by theologians before a decision can be reached with regard to the possibility of bringing peace to the Church, by means of a procedure based theologically on the conception of Supplemental Ordination in any of its forms."

The second memorandum, which opposes the theory, is strongly argued and logically closely knit. It stands firmly on the traditional view of ordination, somewhat statically conceived. The argument owes its force to an "either . . . or" type of approach. The grace of ordination is the Apostolic commission which has either been received or not. There can be no question of less and more: "A bishop does not receive 'more' of the commission than a priest. He receives it for a different purpose." The theory of Supplemental Ordination appears to imply that something has been received at a previous ordination to which something requires to be added. If nothing has been received on the previous occasion, then it is ordination which is required; if something has been received, it is difficult to conceive what needs to be added.

With this hinterland of thought, the memorandum goes on to examine what meaning can be attached to Supplemental Ordination in the case (*a*) of non-episcopal ministers receiving it from a bishop and (*b*) priests and bishops already episcopally ordained receiving it from the hands of non-episcopal ministers.

In the former case (if it is believed that non-episcopal ministers have received an adequate ministerial commission) it would be an iteration of a previous ordination, and as such a profanity, or (if it is held that they have not received any such ministerial commission) it would constitute a full ordination *de novo* and, on the episcopal side, be intended as such, in which case the idea of supplement which is vital to the theory, is a misnomer. The only other meaning which could be attached to such a rite would be the conveyance of jurisdiction, in which case the term Supplemental Ordination and the laying on of hands should be replaced by something less confusing. On this point the practice of the Anglican Ordinal fully justifies the authors of the memorandum. Ordination to the Priesthood and the Diaconate is conferred by the laying on of hands, whereas the bestowal of jurisdiction is associated with a form of the "porrectio instrumentorum," the giving and receiving of the appropriate sacred scriptures. On any theory of orders which accepts belief in traditional doctrine of Apostolic Succession, the utmost which those already episcopally ordered can be deemed to receive is an ex-

tension of jurisdiction, and even here a novel view of jurisdiction is required as derived from mere human sources and not inherently due to Christ's commission as such. The only other meaning which might be attached to it would seem to be to regard it as an occasion of formal public prayer for the increase of actual grace to fulfil the daily duties incumbent upon a new pastoral mission rather like a generalized "Institution Service" or "Commissioning of Missioners." In either case no Ordination is in view, and the term Supplement seems unjustifiable.

The memorandum also includes a criticism of any attempt to use any form of "Supplying the Ceremonies" or "Conditional Ordination" to bridge the gap between episcopal and non-episcopal ministries, or to regard them as in any sense analogous to the method now proposed. The former has no obvious relevance to the present situation, while in the latter the form is undergone solely to dispel a doubt about the fact. In Conditional Ordination the intention is to administer either nothing at all or a full ordination *de novo*. There is no possibility of using it to supply a supplement of any kind.

The conclusion is therefore that "A man has either received the commission of Christ by ordination or he has not. The Church can only recognize the fact, not supplement it, since the efficacy of ordination comes from Him and not merely from the Church's administration."

The first memorandum, in support of the method, urges that ministers act as the agents of "Christ-in-His-Body," and consequently require the commission alike of Christ and of His Church. Here is a point of real soundness. The second memorandum, like the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry*, tends to make the ministerial commission linear rather than triangular. It is a matter not merely of Christ's commission to the individual, but a commission in which Christ and His Church both have their parts to play. Those who maintain the second memorandum in all its fulness would, of course, be the first to maintain that the commission of Christ given through ordination has no meaning apart from its exercise in and through the Church. They might also reply that the way of putting it just adopted imported an artificial duality into our thinking about Christ and His Body—a kind of Nestorianism into our thinking about Christ and the Church. It is, however, difficult to rest satisfied with any theory of Orders which does not give rather greater weight to the rôle of the Church in the conferment of the grace of Orders.

The memorandum proceeds to criticize the place occupied by "recognition" in the second memorandum. There stress was laid upon the fact that the commission of Christ has or has not been received. If it has been received, all that the Church needs to do is to recognize the fact, without attempting to supplement it; if it has not been received, it requires to be fully conferred *de novo*. The first memorandum points out that the divisions of the Church require a modification of this simple and logical standpoint. It is a tenable opinion that the non-episcopal ministries have the commission of Christ for

their splinter group of the Christian Church, similarly that episcopally ordained ministers have the commission of Christ for their own parts of the Church. "The most that we can say, therefore, for any ministries in the divided Church is that they carry a commission conferred by Christ in and through part of His Body, but not the whole." "No Church can be completely assured that its ministers have the fulness of grace and authority until the defect (that they are not conferred unmistakably by Christ and the whole Body) is made good." Possibly they would not disagree unduly with a view that I have sometimes regarded as tenable that there can be no fully valid orders within the Church except those of the whole Church.

So much, then, by way of summary of the two parallel memoranda. The object of the remainder of this essay is to reinforce in some measure the criticism of the second memorandum and to ask two questions which must be seriously faced before any progress can be made along this line of Supplemental Ordination.

1. Further criticism of the point of view contained in the second memorandum.

(*a*) The approach to the whole question displayed is far too rigid and static to meet the problems on the theory of Orders presented by a Divided Christendom. The problem is not as simple as to admit of an "either . . . or" method of treatment. The Body of Christ presents itself not as a single whole but as a series of splinter groups of varying sizes, and differing approximations to the pattern of primitive faith and order. Once the ministerial commission is seen to be not a direct commission of Christ but of Christ in His Body, and that a broken and mutilated Body, the problem becomes one of greater or less approximation rather than that of possession or not. There is a disquieting logical complacency about the second memorandum which raises the doubt whether the problem is really as simple and straightforward as it makes it appear to be.

(*b*) The question of recognition is not as accidental to the problem as the second memorandum is inclined to make it. Ordained though I am as a priest in the Church of God (according to the Anglican Ordinal) and Catholic in every sense of the term as that commission is intended to be, it is in effect, thanks to the divisions of Christendom, only within the Anglican Communion that that commission carries me. There is at least a supplement of recognition, if not also of actual commission, which it will require before it becomes actually, what it is ideally, a commission which is coextensive with the whole visible Body of Christ. The novelties in this theory of spiritual jurisdiction are due not to any defect in the theory concerned but to the anomaly of a Divided Christendom and the limitations which that anomaly must impose upon any theory, however traditional in character and logical in structure, of the nature of the Christian Ministry.

(*c*) Underlying the problem of the Ministry is a prior problem of the nature of the Church. This is the merest truism in any circles which are seriously interested in Reunion, but it has a

habit of reasserting itself in all kinds of unlikely places when not securely faced at the outset. The implications of the second memorandum, though this is never directly stated, are that the Catholic Church is here almost impassible and certainly impervious to the fact of schism. There is no sense that Christ's commission, apart from the regrettable fact of non-recognition in certain quarters, is to any extent impaired by the divided state of Christendom. Without in the least wishing to ally myself with the implications of the title of Dr Wedel's book *The Coming Great Church*, as exposed in a recent review by Canon Ramsey in THEOLOGY, I would stand rather with the writers of the first memorandum in their frank recognition that the divisions of Christendom have left something to be made up. The Catholic Church is neither wholly a matter of the future nor is it present in all its fulness in a Divided Christendom. It is matter of greater or less approximation to its undivided state. For we are confronted by considerable bodies of Christians acting and living for the most part in a seriously Churchly fashion, a series of splinter Churches with a life and continuity of their own and a Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, which, even if non-episcopally ordered, "do not profess to have received the commission of Christ for purposes different from those of the episcopate." The traditional view of the ministry does not altogether cover such a situation, and it is unrealistic to treat it as the final arbiter in the unprecedented situation of the reintegration of such splinter Churches.

2. The first of the two questions which must be faced before any progress can be made towards the unification of the Christian Ministry is the status, positive as well as negative, of the Free Church Ministries. Here in Anglo-Catholic circles more attention has so far been paid to what they lack than to what they possess. They are certainly not everything which those of us who accept episcopacy with or without a further belief in the Apostolic Succession could desire. They lack at least the element of historical continuity mediated through episcopal ordination. Different groups of Anglicans would phrase rather differently the nature and gravity of this lack. Reference may perhaps be made to my review of *The Apostolic Ministry* in *Laudate*, where the question of what Free Church Ministers were positively as well as negatively was expressly raised with reference to the Bishop of Oxford's contribution to *The Apostolic Ministry*.[1] It will not do merely to assign them an entirely different type of Ministry from our own. They are not simply "prophetic," whereas the Anglican type of Ministry is primarily priestly. The prophetic Ministry, however little some of us exercise it, is not absent from our concept of ministering. We are called to be "messengers" as well as watchmen and stewards of the Lord. Many Free Church Ministries feel themselves to be Ministries of the Word and Sacraments, "though they may conceive those purposes rather differently." Nor can the difficulty be really surmounted

[1] *Laudate*, vol. xxv, No. 83, June, 1947, p. 45.

by an ingenious and irenic suggestion by Dom Gregory Dix in *The Apostolic Ministry* that they possess the episcopate but not the apostolate.[1] The difficulty in terminology is the least of the difficulties here. The whole conception of the Apostolate as set forth in the book rests on premises and in part on methods which can at best be regarded as non-proven by many Anglican scholars. The real difficulty is that non-episcopally ordained ministers in many, though not all, Churches are claiming to exercise the same sort of commission as we do ourselves without the framework of an historical continuity based upon and mediated through the historic episcopate.

Latent ambiguities like a "real Ministry of the Word and the Sacraments" leave untouched the real hinterland of interpretation behind both the Anglican and the Free Church interpretation of the formula. Before any progress can be made, we need a statement, realistic and unambiguous, from the supporters of the second memorandum about what they believe the Free Church Ministries to be positively no less than negatively.

3. The third problem is a different though related one. What can an episcopally ordained minister be deemed to receive in any act of supplemental ordination? It must not be forgotten that some Free Churchmen are no less suspicious of Supplemental Ordination than the authors of the second memorandum. They regard it as an effort to secure their full ordination *de novo* by a subterfuge. In the reintegration of the Christian Ministry no less than in other fields it is harder to receive than to give, and if a mutuality of giving could be seriously maintained, I imagine that many minds on the Free Church side would be set at greater ease over the whole method.

Speaking personally, I would suggest two lines of thought about what I as an Anglican might receive if called upon to take part in an act of Supplemental Ordination at the hands of Free Church Ministers duly accredited to perform a unification of the Christian Ministry in an act of organic reunion.

(*a*) At present I am estopped from exercising my Ministry among the Free Churches not merely out of loyalty to my own Church, nor merely because such jurisdiction as I have received does not extend to their denominations, but because I do not consider myself ministerially commissioned to serve them.

(*b*) At an Anglican Ordination the laying on of hands does not merely confer a commission to exercise a contemporaneous Ministry. It is also the reception of a tradition of ministering which, because of the possession of the Apostolic Succession by our own Church, makes the recipient heir of an historic succession of ministering. In a great act of Supplemental Ordination, I should become by the same method of laying on of hands heir of other traditions of ministering to which I am at present a stranger, owing to the divisions within the Body of Christ.

Three objections may be raised at this stage to the point of view which is here offered for consideration:

[1] *The Apostolic Ministry*, pp. 295-6.

i. The second memorandum notes carefully that "the Free Churches do not profess to have received the commission of Christ for purposes different from those of the episcopate, but for identical purposes, though they may conceive those purposes rather differently." While this appears to assume some positive valuation of the Free Church Ministries, or at least the readiness to examine what these ministries say of themselves, it is taken as evidence that Supplemental Ordination is not the right method of approach to the problem of unification of the Christian Ministry. But it is precisely these elements of identity and difference which might be interpreted as making the practice of Supplemental Ordination a reasonable and natural one. There is enough identity to exclude the absolute necessity of an ordination *de novo*, but enough difference to make the idea of a supplement of our present commission other than a profanity. If there were complete identity in the conception of Christ's commission, there would be no need for any supplementary rite; if there were complete diversity, a full *de novo* exchange of commissions could alone avail. Because elements of identity and of difference are both concerned, a supplementary procedure has some measure of theological as well as of practical justification. It is not merely a matter of jurisdiction (for which the procedure of Supplemental Ordination would be overweighted), nor yet of recognition alone, though even on these grounds the authors of the first memorandum would probably be prepared to regard Supplemental Ordination as legitimate: it is also a matter the character and traditions of ministering which make Supplemental Ordination a natural method to employ.

ii. It might further be urged that this essay, if it proved anything at all, proved rather too much, since parity of reasoning might be held to demand Supplemental Ordination as a means of reconstituting the unity of two Churches, both of which possessed and valued the historic episcopate in historic succession. The answer to this difficulty has already been given above. Where the tradition of ministering is essentially one without serious divergence of approach, and the ministerial succession is uniform, there can be no place for Supplemental Ordination. The participation of the bishops of each Church in the consecrations of the other forms the only natural and necessary link between the ministries of two such nearly related episcopally ordered Churches. The spiritually costly and theologically complex method of Supplemental Ordination is not in such cases required.

iii. This essay has been concerned solely with the theory of Supplemental Ordination, and as such a discussion of the practical difficulties which would beset it as a method would not be in place. These are serious and real. It would be easier to accomplish, *e.g.*, in Ceylon than in Great Britain, and the practice might pall with continual repetition. It depends in part on the lengths to which we are really prepared to go for the Reunion of Christendom. The problem is to some extent eased if we remind ourselves of the objective which lies ahead and to which Supplemental Ordination

might very fittingly be applied, the restoration of the organic unity of a not inconsiderable part of Christendom. It might be considerably less fitting if applied to a series of partial concordats with a number of non-episcopal Churches. With such practical objections and the means whereby they might be overcome this essay does not pretend to deal specifically. It is rather an attempt to review the two memoranda incorporated by the Lambeth Fathers in their report from the theological point of view. It is offered as the basis for further clarification and discussion by way of a critical footnote to the second memorandum and a tentative expansion of the argument of the first.

H. E. W. Turner.

The Philosophy of Christian Existence[1]

Just as after the first World War the philosophy of phenomenology became a kind of intellectual fashion, so "existentialism" and existential philosophy have become fashionable after the catastrophic end of the second. It is as though there lay in this philosophy, in which the attempt is made to see man without any illusions in all the nakedness and loneliness of his creaturely existence, the answer to all the questions which oppress us in the hopeless situation of our day. Does it not seem as if Kierkegaard had our age in mind when he spoke the prophetic word that the time would come "when man will discover, perhaps at great cost, that the true way to the Absolute leads not through Doubt but through Despair"?

It is clear therefore that existential philosophy is more than a mere fashion, despite the purely topical elements contained in it, and its remarkable topical appeal in Germany is only partly explained by the historical catastrophe which has befallen our people. In France, too, where a catastrophe has also been experienced, but on a far smaller scale, Jean Paul Sartre's existentialism is playing an important part in post-war intellectual life. Thus it is clear that this movement of thought wells up from the deeper unity of the total destiny of Western civilization in its encounter with the dæmonic forces of technology.

So far, however, the "philosophy of human existence" has merely raised the questions of existence and essence as the inexorably and inescapably fundamental problems of the age, without providing a positive solution, which is why it has been called "nihilistic," and justly so as far as Heidegger's particular brand is concerned. Important as it is today to recognize with no illusions the full extent of the present catastrophe in the spiritual as well as in the material world, nevertheless the fundamental distinction that must be made is whether this awareness leads to a state of hopeless or of wholesome despair, to nihilism or to new faith.

[1] This article was published in *Merkur*, 1947, No. 3 (Heller und Wegner Verlag, Baden-Baden). It has been translated by Stanley Godman. For an earlier article on Romano Guardini (by Irene Marinoff), see Theology, June, 1942, pp. 335-41.

Just as it is no mere coincidence that the founder of existential philosophy, Kierkegaard, was a radical theologian, so this philosophy leads inevitably to the Absolute, to use Kierkegaard's own words, and into the realm of a new theology. It is a well-known fact that the Protestant dogmatics of Karl Barth and his school owe much stimulation to that dialectical theology which is in many ways a form of "evangelical existentialism." Between Catholic philosophy and theology and existentialism no such direct connexion exists, whereas there were close contacts through the person of Max Scheler between Catholic thought and phenomenology. Moreover, Heidegger derived from Husserl and he in his turn from the theologian Bolzano; Heidegger has, however, developed away from his Christian-Catholic starting-point.

Although there is a lack of direct contacts between Catholic thought and existentialism, nevertheless in so far as they represent genuine problems and concerns of our time, the questions raised by this contemporary movement have not remained unanswered by Catholic thinkers. Perhaps one may say that they have in fact received from the Catholic point of view an answer of more than merely temporary validity—above all in the work of Romano Guardini, a work which represents a total philosophy of Christian existence.

Guardini owes his reputation as one of the leading Christian thinkers of our day to his great biographical works, in which he has created a new and unique type of intellectual biography. It is, however, often overlooked that in his first books his intentions were definitely philosophical. His philosophical work *Der Gegensatz* (*A Philosophy of Contrast*), which appeared twenty-two years ago, is an attempt to achieve a "philosophy of the living—concrete experience" in reaction against the tendency shown by Western philosophy in recent centuries to concentrate on the abstract. Out of the polarity of the opposites which, in their unity, form the Whole, Guardini tried to achieve what he called "living conceptions" as understood by the ancients, as opposed to the "specifically conceptual conceptions" of the modern age, which recognize in the mathematical formula their chief criterion of perfection. Nevertheless, this attempt, in the course of which he did not disdain to make use of the methods of biology, did not lead him into the realm of so-called "vitalism."

Guardini has applied and developed in his studies of intellectual development the system which he elaborated in the above-mentioned philosophical work. At the same time, however, this turning to the biographical was also a turning away from systematic method. Guardini set aside the systematic basis of biology and put in its place the historical basis of biography which sheds so much more light on the problem of living—concrete existence. In biography he discovered what we may call the historical dimension, the specifically human dimension.

To this turning of Guardini's to the realm of the historical-concrete we owe his works on Pascal and Augustine, Hölderlin and Dostoievsky, in which he developed his own method of intellectual

historiography. In really penetrating analyses he tackles the total phenomenon of the subject before him. His chief concern is "exactness." Not without reason this word constantly recurs in his expositions whether he calls Hölderlin "in a very exact sense a mysterious figure" or speaks of this poet's "splendid exactness of language, which not only sustains but even provokes critical inquiry." Guardini cannot be praised too highly for the example he sets precisely in this exact approach to his problems.

What attracted Guardini to Hölderlin was first of all his achievement of a perfect unity of life and work: Hölderlin created his poetry so directly out of his own existence, that the highest of his conceptions, Nature, became the very embodiment of life itself. Further even than that, however, Guardini sees this poet for whom the gods were not mere symbols but a reality, in the line of the religious prophets of the West. In an investigation which penetrates deeper than anything that has previously been said on the subject, Guardini interprets the nature of Hölderlin's Gods and the remarkably special rôle which it is given to Christ to play in their midst.

Guardini traces the line of religious prophets back through Hölderlin and Dante to Æschylus and Pindar, and calls the young Swabian poet "a prophet and seer the like of whom there has not been since Dante." Shortly before the work on Hölderlin he had devoted a treatise to Dante, which is not really a biography of the poet's mind but rather the preface to such a biography in the form of a study of the angels in the Divine Comedy. But what horizons are opened up by the study of this aspect of Dante's work! How clearly the distinction emerges between the nature of Christian existence as opposed to mere existentialism in the confrontation of Dante's and Rilke's angels! Guardini does not deny for one moment that the innermost essence and reality of Rilke's angels is religious, he merely establishes the fact that they are of a different kind, and in doing so he says some fundamental things, almost in parentheses, about the "secret mysticism of the philosophy of existence."

The ideas which were discussed in this book only incidentally were developed in the preceding book on Pascal into a definite and positive statement of Christian existentialism. As Kierkegaard has been called the father of existentialism, so Pascal has been called his most important forerunner. And it certainly does seem as if this vigilant and truly prophetic genius anticipated three hundred years ago that almost mysterious "Angst" or fear of life which inspires modern man confronted with the relentless doom-like progression of technics. Perhaps his anticipation of modern existentialism is connected with the mathematical genius and imagination in the realm of technics which gave him a premonition of things still blessedly hidden from the eyes of his contemporaries. Whereas the mood of his age was one of scepticism, his basic mood was one of despair: "Men are so necessarily mad, that not to want to be mad would only be another form of madness."

Pascal did not, however, stick fast in this mood of despair any more than Kierkegaard. If the "experience of existence," as under-

stood by existentialism, has been compared with the process of religious revival, then the two coincide in the case of Pascal. The experience of Faith came upon him with such sudden, unheard of violence that it determined the whole of the rest of his life, including his philosophical thought. What emerges as a result of this experience, however, is no more or less negative existentialism but a very positive Christian philosophy of existence: the "philosophie du cœur," which Guardini rediscovered in Pascal and actively developed. Beginning his "philosophy of the concrete" in 1925, ten years later he reached in the work on Pascal the "concretissimum," the human heart, in which all his further thinking and philosophizing are centred. He does not, however, see Pascal the "philosopher of the heart" as an isolated figure, but places him in a great tradition, 'the noblest tradition known to Western Christendom," the "philosophia and theologia cordis," which he traces back to Plato, finds expressed in St Paul and continued in St Augustine, St Bernard, and St Francis; he calls Bonaventura its systematizer, Dante its poet, and continues the line into modern times, even including Nietzsche—truly a noble tradition embracing the most illustrious spirits.

In the same year as the work on Pascal, a second extensive work appeared which develops several ideas contained in the Pascal study: the story of the conversion of St Augustine. The fact that the problem of "Christian existence" is the central preoccupation of this work results directly from its theme. But here, beyond a clear statement of the problem, an answer is also given which provides us with what we may describe as a number of valuable bricks towards the building of a philosophy of the heart which one would like to see joined together to make a unified structure, not merely for the sake of forming a system of thought, but so that the work done here in elaborating a Christian philosophy of existence should become more apparent. For the "heart" as understood by Guardini has nothing to do with modern sentimentality: "It is the heart in man which responds to God's holy Truth which is also God's holy Love—it is the sphere of Christian inwardness." Not "feeling" in the modern sense of the word but "spirit" (Geist). Not detached or even abstract spirit but "spirit warmed by the blood, susceptible to the sway of destiny, vulnerable and exposed but protected at the same time, poor and yet rich in heavenly things, capable of both tears and laughter."

We cannot expound here in detail how Guardini develops from the central conception of the heart the categories of a philosophy of Christian existence. It is unnecessary to add that his book on Dostoievsky, who forms a strange trinity with Nietzsche and Kierkegaard, also deals with the problems of Christian existence, although it is only a preliminary study, in which the method is merely being tried out.

How greatly the characters of the great Eastern writer, who belongs at the same time to the deepest Western tradition, fill and move the mind of Guardini becomes clear when, in order to fathom

the mystery of Hölderlin's Diotima, he places her beside Dante's Beatrice and Nastassja Philippovna, the noble woman in Dostoievsky's *Idiot*.

Guardini has developed his philosophy of existence and philosophy of the heart in the study of the lives of great men of faith. But what would a philosophy of Christian existence be without Christ? As the final volume in his series of biographical studies and published in the same year as the Hölderlin book, we have inevitably a work on the Person of Christ Himself. It carries the simple and yet comprehensive title *The Nature of Christianity*, and is, despite its narrow compass, perhaps his richest and ripest book. With incomparable succinctness and "exactness" the special quality of Christianity is brought out in this work. By contrasting Him with the Buddha, the greatest of all founders of religions, whose nature and significance Guardini describes with the same open mindedness as he brings to bear on all that is genuine and great, on Hölderlin's gods as well as on Rilke's angels, he makes clear how completely different the nature of Christ is from that of the Buddha. In Christ the Teaching and the Person are absolutely identical. belief in Christianity is always belief in Christ as the Transformer of the World. Since Christ came into the world and gave to human history its innermost meaning, decision for or against Him has been the supreme criterion of the spiritual life.

Though distinct from the fact of Christ, the fact of Pentecost is nevertheless bound up with the Incarnation as the heart and centre of History, and Guardini interprets it with extraordinary depth and subtlety. He calls Pentecost the birthday of the Christian Faith as a "state of being in Christ," brought about not by mere religious experience but by the Holy Spirit. Previously Christ, with His whole existence, had stood "before" men. There was a gulf between man and Christ. Now, through the fact of Pentecost, the relationship is changed. Christ, His Person, His Life, and redeeming activity now become part of man's inner experience. Now, for the first time through the Spirit as Personal Love, men can become truly "Christians."

Romano Guardini's thinking culminates in these ideas on the inner existence of Christianity. It is not merely an attempt to formulate a Christian philosophy of existence, it represents more than that—namely, the conquest of existentialism by faith in Jesus Christ.

ERICH MÜLLER.

Studies in Texts

THE UNJUST STEWARD

Lk. xvi, 1-8a

THE current explanations of this parable are all of them more or less unsatisfactory. It is impossible to present them to an ordinary congregation without some misgiving. They fall roughly into two

groups. (*a*) Some regard the parable as addressed to the Christian believer. The lesson is, "As the steward exercises forethought in worldly things, so should the Christian disciple in spiritual things." This view is followed, for example, by Trench, Creed, and Manson,[1] and some such view is perhaps necessitated if we regard v. 8b as our Lord's own comment on the parable. But this explanation makes the dishonesty of the steward, which is central to the parable, a secondary and almost irrelevant feature of the explanation. A story of an honest, prudent man would serve equally well.[2] (*b*) Others regard the parable as addressed to the outsider, as being a parable of repentance. This view is advocated by, among others, Anselm, Bruce, and B. T. D. Smith.[3] Then there are two courses open to us. We may seek a true analogy to repentance in the steward's conduct. Then serious questions are raised concerning the nature of repentance, and our answers must be related to the rest of our Lord's teaching. This none of the commentators seems to do adequately. Or else the analogy is more general. In face of financial crisis, the steward took precautions. In face of judgment men should take precautions—namely, repent. But once more the injustice of the steward becomes irrelevant. An honest man may equally well be confronted by financial crisis. In the following pages I shall attempt to re-examine the parable in its Lucan setting.

I. *Position.*—The Lost Sheep, The Lost Coin, The Prodigal Son, The Unjust Steward, The Rich Man and Lazarus form a group of parables, probably all of them from Luke's special source.[4] Apart from the sayings group, xvi, 8b-18, they follow continuously. The first three of these are usually considered to be closely linked, their theme being the return of man to God. The last two are linked by the identity of the opening words, "There was a certain rich man, . . ." and it is sometimes thought that they are linked in theme, in that both are concerned with the proper use of worldly wealth. This seems to have been the belief of the original compiler, since the sayings group xvi, 8b-18 is largely concerned with this subject.

But there are grave difficulties in this classification. The comments in the sayings group xvi, 8b-18 do not seem to fit the parable, indeed in some cases, especially in v. 10, to contradict it. And The Rich Man and Lazarus is more concerned with repentance than with the use of wealth. It might be entitled "The Repentance that came Too Late." Its lesson is that now is the time for man to do what he can to put himself right with God. If this is so, it is clear that it links

[1] Trench: *Notes on the Parables*, p. 429. Creed: *The Gospel according to St Luke*, p. 201. Manson in *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, p. 584.

[2] Cf. Bruce: *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 361: "For though we may not insist that no bad men shall be employed to teach wisdom, we may reasonably lay it down as a rule that bad men should not be used if they can be dispensed with; that is, if good men will serve the purpose equally well. . . ."

[3] Anselm: *Hom.* 12. Referred to by Trench, *loc. cit.* Bruce: loc. cit. B. T. D. Smith: *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 110.

[4] The Lost Sheep is assigned to L by Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, pp. 243 ff.), Manson (in *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, p. 574). Many scholars, however, assign it to Q.

up with the third parable of this group. The Prodigal Son is a parable of repentance that came in time.

Omitting for the moment the parable of The Unjust Steward, it is clear that this section represents a logical development. The Lost Sheep and The Lost Coin are concerned with the initiative of God in seeking the sinner. The Prodigal Son is concerned with the action which man must take if he is to appropriate the help which God offers. The Rich Man and Lazarus drives home the lesson that time is not unlimited. It is at least worthwhile to test whether The Unjust Steward cannot take its place in this development of thought.

II. *The Prodigal Son and The Unjust Steward.*— If we are to link these parables together, we must link The Unjust Steward with what precedes and what follows. For this purpose, we shall consider only the first part of the parable of The Prodigal Son, that part directly concerned with the man repenting (xv, 11-24). Analysis reveals that between these verses and xvi, 1-8a there is a well-marked formal parallelism.

(i) A man has lived an evil life. The Son has wasted the goods which he has had from his father. The steward has wasted the goods entrusted to him by his master. (The word διασκορπίζω is used in each case.)

(ii) Because of their evil life, both are threatened with starvation. The son, through sinful extravagance, has reached the end of his resources. The steward is confronted with the prospect of losing his post.

(iii) Both are represented as deliberating on the course of action which they will take, and reach a decision. The son decides to return to his father's house. The steward decides to forgive his lord's debtor's a portion of their indebtedness.

(iv) Both act upon their resolve.

(v) Both are reinstated. The son is received back by the father. The steward is praised by his lord.

This analysis becomes more illuminating as we study it more closely. Let us consider the fifth section first. The reinstatement of the son is made abundantly clear. The reinstatement of the steward is found only in the words with which, according to our division, the parable ends: "The lord praised the unjust steward because he had acted prudently." These words have given rise to great perplexity. I suggest that they should be taken at their face value. At the dreaded interview when the steward produced his accounts, he was met, not with blame and dismissal, but with praise. In view of the further analysis which we shall give, I think that this, the obvious explanation, can stand on its own feet. But, as we shall see, it is possible that we have only a mutilated fragment of the original ending.

Let us now consider the fourth head of the analysis. In each case is recorded action consequent upon deliberation in the face of crisis. Now if these actions stood alone, we should at once conclude that they represented types of action commended by our Lord. The one is explicit acknowledgment of sin as the act indicative of explicit re-

pentance. The other is the exercise of charity in the form of forgiveness of debts. The acknowledgment of sin and the forgiveness of those indebted to us stand side by side in the Lord's Prayer, implying the conditions on which God's forgiveness can be received. Taken by themselves, without regard to the circumstances in which they are set, these acts would signify *μετάνοια*, a change of the course of action, a turning point which lays men open to God's saving initiative. And it is notable that the forgiveness of debts is a more prominent symbol of repentance in our Lord's teaching than the acknowledgment of transgression.

It is when we turn to the third head of the analysis that the difficulty of such an interpretation of the action of the unjust steward becomes plain. The deliberation which the steward has with himself, and to which we are by our Lord's words admitted, shows that he is actuated not by pure charity, but by the desire to escape the consequences of his sins. And this, we should be told, is no kind of repentance.

Now this deliberative soliloquy is important. Outside these parables it is found only in the parable of The Rich Fool. (In the Lucan version of the parable of The Wicked Husbandmen it is clearly secondary.)[1] And the parable of The Rich Fool, both by its opening and its theme, seems to be allied with the parables of this series.

Let us consider the function of this deliberative soliloquy in The Unjust Steward. This seems to be threefold.

(*a*) It supplies us with the motive for an act which is outwardly commendable, an act of forgiveness. Its effect is to show that act in an unfavourable light. It is an act of self-interest to which the steward has been driven in order to escape the consequences of his sin.

(*b*) It supplies the intention of the action, that which the action is designed to bring about. The steward hopes to escape starvation by being received by his lord's debtors.

(*c*) It underlines the contrast between the actual consequences of the action, and that which it was designed to bring about. The steward received more than he hoped for. He received the praise of his master.

An exactly similar function is performed by the internal dialogue of The Prodigal Son.

(*a*) It supplies us with the motive of an outwardly commendable action, and its effect is to show that action in an unfavourable light. This point is often missed, but it lies on the surface. The prodigal knows that he has sinned, but what drives him back to his father is not sorrow for sin, but the thought of the food which he sees no prospect of obtaining save by return to his father's house. "And he

[1] Luke xx, 13. "And the lord of the vineyard said, What shall I do? I will send my beloved son." Mark xii, 6: "He has yet one, a beloved son. He sent him last unto them saying, They will reverence my son." Luke represents the lord of the vineyard as deliberating. But Matthew and Mark do not. Luke is here dependent on Mark.

would fain have filled his belly with the husks which the swine did eat . . . and coming to himself he said, I will arise and go to my father."

(*b*) It supplies the intention of the action. The prodigal hopes to escape starvation by being admitted by his father as a hired servant.

(*c*) It underlines the contrast between the intention and the actual consequences of the act. The son is not received as a servant, but reinstated as a son.

This analysis should have shown two things. First, these parables are strictly parallel in form. Second, they are concerned with the same theme.

In this exegesis of The Unjust Steward I am much indebted to the treatment of the parable of The Prodigal Son given by Nygren (*Agape and Eros*, I, 57 ff). He insists, against Jülicher, that some, at any rate, of the parables cannot be understood as arguments of the form, "Man naturally acts thus: therefore God must act in a similar manner." They can be understood only in the light of God's Agape. The father's reception of the son would strike the hearers as paradoxical. Men would not act thus, but God does. We should not look for the ground of God's love in the qualities of those who are the object of this love. Similarly, the praise given to the steward is paradoxical. But this is so only because we are looking for some quality in the steward which would "justify" the expenditure of Agape upon him. In certain respects the above exegesis of the two parables may add something to Nygren.

(*a*) Repentance can show itself in two ways, by explicit acknowledgment of sin and by the exercise of a new charity.

(*b*) Looked at from God's side, the first step towards reinstatement which the sinner takes is not taken out of pure sorrow for sin or out of pure charity. These are the fruits of the consummated Christian life, not the prerequisites of receiving God's help. If they were man would never receive it. Men turn to God because their sin drives them into an impossible position, and they fear the consequences. We are in danger of treating repentance as though it were a special kind of good work which merits forgiveness as a reward.

(*c*) The grace of God meets man's discreditable approach, just because it is an approach, and gives him what far exceeds his calculations.

III. *The Unjust Steward and The Rich Man and Lazarus.*—If the above interpretation of The Unjust Steward is correct, it not only fits into the series which is completed by The Rich Man and Lazarus. It makes the series more coherent. The repentance which is found in The Prodigal Son is explicit, and shows itself by an acknowledgment of guilt. The repentance which would have saved the rich man, but is not forthcoming, is implied to be charity. Hence it is analogous to the mode of repentance shown by The Unjust Steward. The transition from the parable of The Prodigal Son to the parable of The Unjust Steward is therefore made less abrupt, and the development of thought is smoother when the parable of The Unjust Steward stands between.

IV. *The Parable in the Tradition.*—If the above interpretation is correct, it is clear that misunderstanding of the parable of The Unjust Steward results from the failure to see the parallel between it and the parable of The Prodigal Son, and failure to understand the irony which, in each, characterizes our Lord's treatment of man's penitence. Once these are missed, the story becomes unintelligible.

There is a further factor which might contribute to misunderstanding in the early Church. The word steward is closely connected with the ministry of the Church, and the wickedness of the steward and his reinstatement would seem to demand an application not in the sphere of the conversion of the outsider, but in the sphere of the ministry. Such a parallel would be shocking to Christians. There is some reason for thinking that this factor may have operated. Although the parable is continuous with The Prodigal Son, the audience is different. The Prodigal Son is addressed, with the two parables which precede it, to the murmuring Pharisees (xv, 2). The Unjust Steward is addressed to the disciples (xvi, 1a). But xvi, 14 assumes that the Pharisees have been present throughout. It is probable that we may here trace the assumption that all parables concerning stewardship were addressed to the disciples, and were concerned with the ministry.

In view of all these facts, it is no wonder that there was, from the first, confusion about the parable's interpretation. It is probable that originally, like The Prodigal Son, it had no express moral given by our Lord. Later various sayings were attached, all of them more or less unsuitable, and all of them more suitable to other occasions.

But there is evidence that the confusion is reflected not only in the variety of morals, but also within the parable itself. Although its elements correspond to those of the first part of The Prodigal Son, the first and last of these elements are very summarily given. We are not even directly told that the steward wasted his master's property. We are left to infer it from the accusation made against him and the general tenor of the story. Compared with the corresponding section of The Prodigal Son, the reinstatement is almost casual. And the last words of the parable contain a notable ambiguity, "Wherefore the lord commended the unjust steward." Does this refer to our Lord, or to the steward's lord? We have assumed above that it is to be read in the latter sense. But the natural assumption on first reading would be to take it in the former sense. If this is so, it must be a compiler's comment on the story. But considering the nature of the story, it is impossible that anyone should have made this comment unless in the original story there was some longer and more explicit expression of our Lord's judgment on the steward in the form of an account of forgiveness and reinstatement. Troubled by this fuller statement, someone added this sentence as a comment. But the offending section still seemed intolerable, and dropped out of the tradition, the original comment doing service in its place.

Thus, from an examination of the beginning and ending sections of the parable, there is reason to think that it may have suffered

mutilation. Owing to misunderstanding of its real meaning, both the sin against the master and the forgiveness have been slurred over.

JOHN COUTTS.

Why You Should Read It—XV

RICHARD BAXTER'S "THE REFORMED PASTOR"

WHATEVER opinion one may hold about the theological or ecclesiastical propriety of Baxter's status, first as Lecturer and afterwards as Vicar of St Mary's, Kidderminster, the greatness of his pastorate is beyond question. We have his own account[1] of the astonishing transformation wrought between his arrival in 1641 (when he was not yet twenty-six years old) and his final departure on the eve of the Restoration, nor is there any reason to suppose his description to be other than substantially true. It was, in Hensley Henson's memorable phrase, "truly a noble and precious thing, one of the *magnalia Dei* for which the Church blesses God."[2] Yet his labours and aspirations extended far outside the boundaries of his own parish. Baxter was acutely conscious of three pressing needs in the Church of his time beside which all else seemed unimportant: a revival of true pastoral fidelity among the English clergy as a whole; a well-instructed laity willing to submit to godly discipline; and a recognizable unity in fundamentals, expressed in active co-operation, between *all* the parties that claimed to be Catholic and Reformed. He recognized also the interdependence of these needs, and that no considerable improvement could be expected in any one direction unless attention were paid to all three. He determined, therefore, to invite all the well-disposed clergy in the county to join him in an enterprise specially designed to increase pastoral devotion, strengthen ecclesiastical discipline, and encourage theological unity.

An opportunity to make the first move lay to hand in the weekly meetings of local ministers held in Baxter's house after the Thursday morning Lecture. When he opened his mind to them at one such meeting in the spring of 1652, his proposals were well received, and it was resolved that a larger meeting should be held in Worcester to discuss the same project. So there emerged the famous Worcestershire Association for which Baxter was commissioned to draw up an *Agreement* consisting of "so much of the Church Order and Discipline, as the Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Independent are agreed in, as belonging to the Pastors of each particular Church." To this document, published in July, 1653, fifty-eight ministers subscribed, representing about half the parishes in the diocese of Worcester. But the design was to be carried yet a stage further. An effective ecclesiastical discipline presupposes a well-instructed laity, as Baxter's own parochial experience had quickly taught him. For

[1] *The Autobiography of Richard Baxter, being The Reliquiæ Baxterianæ Abridged from the folio (1696)*, edited by J. M. Lloyd Thomas, 1925, Everyman Edition, 1931, pp. 78-79.

[2] *Puritanism in England*, 1912, p. 166.

this reason he had already become an enthusiast for systematic catechizing and, in a sermon preached before Cromwell in Westminster Abbey on Christmas Eve, 1654, he even went so far as to declare it a duty of the Government "to see that Catechists were appointed in every Church; that they were properly paid; and that no persons of any age or rank should be excused from them, save for certain good reasons."[1] When he urged the same duty upon his brethren in the Association, they replied by asking him to write both a Catechism and further *Articles of Agreement*, with "an earnest exhortation to the people to submit to this way." This appeared in 1656 as "The Agreement of Divers Ministers of Christ in the County of Worcester and some adjacent parts for catechizing and personal instructing all in their several parishes that will consent thereto."

Here we have the immediate *raison d'être* of *The Reformed Pastor*.[2] It was, strangely enough, the happy product of what at the time must have seemed a grievous misfortune. The circumstances were recalled by Baxter in a long Preface, dated April 16th, 1656, addressed to "My Reverend And Dearly Beloved Brethren, The Faithful Ministers Of Christ, In Britain And Ireland." In the true Puritan style, the Association had agreed to meet at Worcester on December 4th, 1655, for "a solemn humbling of their souls before the Lord, for their long neglect of so great and necessary a duty," and to pray God's blessing upon their venture. Baxter was to be the preacher.

> "In answer to their desires, I prepared the following discourse; which, though it proved longer than could be delivered in one or two sermons, yet I intended to have entered upon it at that time, and to have delivered that which was most pertinent to the occasion, and reserved the rest to another season. But, before the meeting, by the increase of my ordinary pain and weakness,[3] I was disabled from going thither. To recompense which unwilling omission, I easily yielded to the requests of divers of the brethren, forthwith to publish the things which I had prepared, that they might *see* that which they could not *hear*."[4]

Baxter left no indication whatever of the parts he would have drawn upon had he been well enough to preach, but one may reasonably suggest that if he had been disposed to deliver three sermons his themes might well have been: The Duties of Every Christian Pastor (cc. I-III). The Sins of The Ministry (cc. IV-V), The Work of Catechizing (cc. VI-VIII). Certainly this threefold

[1] *Vide* F. J. Powicke, *A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter, 1615-1691*, 1924, p. 128.

[2] 1st edition, 1656. 2nd edition, with Appendix, 1657. Reprinted *in extenso* in collected editions of his *Practical Works*: folio edition 1707; Orme 1830; reprint of 1707 folio, 1847; anonymous 1825; Ward's *Standard Library of Divinity*, 1841; James Nisbet, reprint of 1657 edition, 1860 (the edition cited in the above essay). No later reprints.

[3] Though he lived to a great age, Baxter was harassed by poor health until very near the end of his ministry at Kidderminster. It is worthy of note that it was a complete breakdown in 1646 which compelled his resignation as chaplain to the Parliamentary forces, and hastened his return to "that place which had the chiefest of my Labours and yielded me the greatest Fruits of comfort" (*Autobiography*, p. 25); and that physical debility was also responsible for his giving *The Reformed Pastor* to the world!

[4] *R.P.*, p. 2.

division facilitates any attempt to convey a brief yet not misleading impression of the extensive subject matter in this book of more than five hundred pages.

Of the three, the second theme was especially appropriate to a "day of humiliation"; it also amply justified the reference to Gildas and Salvianus in the full title of the book. "I pretend not to the sapience of Gildas, nor to the sanctity of Salvian, as to the degree," wrote Baxter, "but by their names I offer you an excuse for plain dealing."[1] Though his manner might seem offensive to many, it was a risk he was prepared to take: "It is the mere necessity of the souls of men, and my desire of their salvation, and the prosperity of the Church, which forced me to this arrogancy and immodesty, if so it must be called."[2] In any event, the indisputable "success" of his own ministry, and his avowed readiness to place himself under the judgment of his own fiercest strictures, were more than enough to exonerate him from accusations of pride or hypocrisy. An unsparing confession of "the behaviour of the ministers of the gospel, from the days of Christ till now,"[3] takes the clerical reader to "the core of our shame" and forms the prelude to a devastating analysis of those present sins of the ministry "that cry loudly for humiliation and speedy reformation."[4] First in his list stands pride, so prevalent and so insidious that it can be seen determining the matter, style, and delivery of sermons; choosing our company; controlling our reasoning; teaching some to aspire to temporal eminence; leading others to envy or malign those who "stand in their light, or by any means do eclipse their glory, or hinder the progress of their idolized reputation";[5] prompting us to magnify our own opinions and to be censorious of all who differ so that "while we cry down Papal infallibility . . . we would, too many of us, be popes ourselves, and have all stand to our determination";[6] worst of all, enticing us to "take up with the fame of godliness instead of godliness."[7] Next comes an "undervaluing the unity and peace of the whole Church";[8] a readiness to speak and preach for it and a corresponding failure to promote it by our practice—let it be owned that "we have contrarily lived in mutual jealousies, and drowned holy love in bitter contendings,"[9] thereby bringing religion into contempt among the masses of ordinary people. He points further to negligence in divine studies; lifeless, dull, and lazy preaching; a narrow parochialism which would shut its eyes to the needs of neighbouring parishes; and a failure to execute moral discipline, for lack of which "many do turn over to the separate congregations."[10] Finally he notes the "epidemical malady" of time-serving which "occasioneth the enemies to say, that reputation and preferment is our religion and our reward";[11] an excessive preoccupation with worldly business so that "money is too strong an argument for some men to answer that can proclaim the love of it to be the root of all evil";[12] and a general

[1] *R.P.*, p. 20. [2] P. 21. [3] P. 187. [4] P. 210. [5] P. 212.
[6] P. 217. [7] P. 224. [8] P. 226. [9] P. 232. [10] P. 258.
[11] P. 276. [12] P. 276.

unwillingness to lay out our talents and substance unreservedly for the advancement of the Kingdom.

The severity of Baxter's censures was more than matched by the warmth and fecundity of his exhortations to true pastoral renewal. The voice which, like a sword of judgment, so sternly drove his brethren to their knees in shame, became always a crutch of compassion raising them to a new vision of "the glory of our high employment,"[1] to a nobler conception of the dignity and privileges of their office, and to that inward consecration of mind and heart without which every pastoral endeavour must remain unfruitful.

> "When your minds are in a heavenly, holy frame, your people are likely to partake of the fruits of it. Your prayers, and praises, and doctrine will be heavenly and sweet to them. They will feel when you have been much with God. That which is on your hearts most, is likely to be most in their ears. I confess I must speak it by lamentable experience, that I publish to my flock the distempers of my soul. . . . Above all, be much in secret prayer and meditation. There you must fetch the heavenly fire that must kindle your sacrifices."[2]

What he conceived to be the *normal* duties of the faithful Christian minister is expressed at length in the opening chapters of his book as a commentary upon St Paul's exhortation to the Ephesian Elders in Acts xx, 28—a text he was at pains to justify as directly applicable to the members of the Association. In view of his exacting demands, it is well to remember that he was speaking throughout not of any armchair ideals of pastoralia but of things which his own experience had taught him and, in the matter of catechizing at least, of a method which he himself practised for five years or more. The two heads under which all pastoral duties may be grouped were provided by his text: the pastor must take heed *first* to himself and then to *all* the flock. His emphasis upon the quality of the pastor's own life had a peculiar significance, of course, for his own day, since it was written at a time when the ejection of incompetent and unworthy ministers had become a matter of Government policy. What Parliamentary and County Committees attempted by force, Baxter sought to achieve by persuasion. In a score of different ways, therefore, he reminded the brethren that "many men have preached Christ, and perished for want of a saving interest in Him."[3] Example must not contradict doctrine: "A practical doctrine must be practically preached."[4] Or, again, he who would teach men all things necessary to their salvation, must himself be well informed: "It is not now and then an idle snatch or taste of studies that will serve to make a sound divine."[5] It was with a deep fraternal understanding that he alluded also to the peculiar difficulties and dangers attending the pastor's life: the especial temptations to which he is prone, not least that of falling into a mere professionalism; the publicity of his actions which makes even small sins scandalous; the need for constant vigilance since "all that a preacher doth is a kind of preaching."[6] We may note that of the public duties, preaching,

[1] R.P., p. 186. [2] Pp. 310-311. [3] P. 81. [4] P. 79.
[5] P. 76 [6] P. 98.

the administration of the sacraments, and the conduct of worship, are discussed *in that order*. But here, as throughout the book, the greatest stress is placed upon the care of individuals. Baxter was prepared to tolerate no excuse from the pastor who failed to know *every* person in his charge *wherever this was a physical possibility*. He must know them not as units but as persons, converting the impenitent, instructing the ignorant, strengthening the weak, rescuing the backsliders, assisting those labouring under some special temptation, comforting the disconsolate, resolving cases of conscience for the doubtful and perplexed, keeping a special eye upon the right ordering of family life, opposing all enemies of the faith, speedily reclaiming those who have been or are in danger of being seduced by error, encouraging the humble and obedient, visiting the sick, reproving those who live offensively, and executing formal discipline. Of all these activities, and especially the last, Baxter wrote in detail, allowing himself the reflection that: "From what hath been said, we may see that the pastoral office is another kind of thing than those men have taken it to be, who think it consisteth in preaching and administering sacraments only."[1] Yet he had a great deal more to add. If it was important that the pastor should know *what* his duties were, it was equally important that he should know *how* they were to be performed. It is worthwhile placing side by side, and repeating, the keywords of the twelve sections devoted to this purpose: the pastoral work, then, must be managed, *purely, laboriously, diligently, prudently, orderly, plainly, evidently, piously, believingly, prayerfully, humbly, meekly, condescendingly, sincerely, affectionately, seriously, zealously, reverently, spiritually, tenderly, patiently*.[2]

The third main theme—the particular pastoral duty of "personal catechizing and instruction of all the flock"—forms the subject of the last three of his eight chapters. Baxter was the last person ever to underestimate the importance or value of preaching, indeed, some of the most valuable pages of the book are those relating to the preacher's office; yet he had discovered that, for sound instruction, preaching alone is not enough:

> "I am daily forced to admire how lamentably ignorant many of our people are, that have seemed diligent hearers of me these ten or twelve years, while I spoke as plainly as I was able to speak . . . whereas, in one hour's familiar instruction of them in private, they seem to understand more, and better entertain it, than they did in all their lives before."[3]

---

[1] *R.P.*, Pp. 162-163.

[2] This section of *The Reformed Pastor*, even more than the rest, reminds the reader of George Herbert's better known but very much shorter *Country Parson*, though Baxter nowhere refers to that book and the resemblances are hardly more than those inevitable in two books dealing with the same subject. Much closer parallels, if not direct dependence, would be revealed, I suspect, by a comparative study of *The Reformed Pastor* and William Perkins' forgotten work *Of the Calling of the Ministerie, Two Treatises: describing the Duties and Dignities of that calling*. Any publisher prepared to undertake a selection from each of these three works, side by side in one volume, would be doing a valuable service to the ministry.

[3] P. 23.

In one place he indicates how he and his two assistants performed their task:

> "We [Baxter and Mr Baldwin] spend Monday and Tuesday from morning to almost night in the work; besides a chapelry, catechized by another assistant [Mr Sargeant], taking about fifteen or sixteen families in a week, that we may go through the parish, which hath above eight hundred families, in a year; and I cannot say yet that one family hath refused to come to me, nor but few persons excused themselves and shifted it off . . . at the delivery of the catechisms, I take a catalogue of the persons of understanding in the parish; and the clerk goeth a week before to every family to tell them when to come, and at what hour (one family at eight o'clock, the next at nine, and the next at ten &c.). And I am forced by the number to deal with a whole family at once; but admit not any of another to be present (ordinarily)."[1]

The minute instructions which he gave (pp. 443-495) "for the right managing of this work" should be read alongside this general description. Taken literally they are invaluable for their insight into the varying capacities, frailties, and needs of ordinary men, and as examples of pastoral method, patience, skill, and tactfulness. But, indirectly, they take us within the walls of Baxter's own study, allowing us to see the things which happened there, from the period of quiet meditation and self-examination preceding the arrival of his catechumens to the moment when he returned to prayer and thanksgiving after their dismissal.

The ministers of the Association could not but listen to such a one as he expounded the benefits, difficulties, and necessity of this work. Difficulties there certainly were, yet "difficulties must excite to greater diligence in a necessary work."[2] Objections there may be also: Will not this exacting work keep a minister from his legitimate studies? Will it not undermine his health? Can it be God's will that he should make a drudge of himelf by a labour so burdensome? Yet for these and other objections Baxter had an answer ready. The finality of his reply to the second question is characteristic of all the rest:

> "What is a candle made for, but to burn? Burnt and wasted we must be; and is it not more fit it should be in lighting men to heaven, and in working for God, than in living to the flesh? How little difference is there between the pleasure of a long and short life when both are at an end! What comfort will it be at death, that you lengthened your life by shortening your work? He that works much, lives much. Our life is to be esteemed according to the end and work of it, and not according to the mere duration."[3]

Baxter completed the book on December 25th, 1655, in the belief that, though the proud might receive it with scorn and the selfish and slothful with distaste and indignation, God would use it "to the awakening of many of His servants to their duty."[4] He was not wholly mistaken. He lived to record with thankfulness that "it prevailed with many ministers to set upon that work which I there exhort them to," and that even "from beyond the seas, I have had letters of request, to direct them how they might bring on that work according as that book hath convinced them that it was their duty."[5]

---

[1] *R.P.*, p. 27. [2] P. 379. [3] P. 419. [4] P. 495.
[5] *Reliquiæ*, pt. i, p. 115.

A second edition, together with a new Appendix, had appeared by 1657. Its influence extended to New England, where it became the model for John Mitchell, the famous minister of Cambridge, Massachusetts. It was translated into German in 1716, and continued to be reprinted in England until the middle of the nineteenth century. Today it can fairly be claimed that its value is fourfold. For the historian it forms one primary source for the study of an important phase in the development of English Puritanism. The theologian may still find in it many things to set him thinking, especially on the problems of episcopacy, the unity of the Church, and ecclesiastical discipline. To the student of biography it is indispensable, standing second only to the *Reliquiæ* for its revelation of Richard Baxter's mind and character. Yet it belongs most of all to the class for whom its author first wrote it: it remains a book by a pastor for pastors. One may readily own that from a strictly literary point of view it is not without blemishes: it suffers from those defects of repetition, prolixity, and formlessness common to the works of writers to whom words come almost too easily, so that it invites abridgement.[1] Baxter himself confessed that had he written less he might have written better.[2] Nevertheless, the sublimity of his subject, the burning sincerity of his expressed convictions, the justice of his admonitions, the grandeur of his ideals, and the directness of his appeal to conscience, give to the *Reformed Pastor* a persuasive power to which the most gracious of literary refinements could add but little. An impressive list might be compiled of distinguished pastors of varying churchmanship who, in the past, have testified to its profound influence upon their own ministry,[3] and there can be few now familiar with the book who would not endorse the judgment of Baxter's most appreciative biographer:

> "Nor can I help setting down the conviction," wrote F. J. Powicke, "that in Baxter the Pastor—which includes Preacher—a modern pastor may still

[1] An admirable modern abridgement is *Gildas Salvianus: The Reformed Pastor, by Richard Baxter, 1656*, edited with an introduction by John T. Wilkinson, Epworth Press, 1939. The Appendices include the *Profession* and *The Propositions Agreed On By The Associated Ministers of The County of Worcester, And Some Adjacent Parts.* Earlier abridgements are: 1766 by Samuel Palmer (2nd edition 1808, reprinted America 1845); 1806 by Thomas Rutherford; 1829 by Dr. William Brown (reached 5th edition by 1862). A useful and attractive little anthology has been published (Independent Press, 1947, 4s.) entitled *As Silver is Tried*, compiled with Introduction by C. E. Surman, Foreword by G. F. Nuttall. It presents brief passages from *The Reformed Pastor* in the form of a month's meditations.

[2] *Autobiography*, p. 102. Yet, when the enormous extent of his other labours are remembered, the wonder is that he was able to write so much so well, supporting his arguments with quotations which, by their number and quality, disclose a range of sources wellnigh unique for a man who could lament his lack of a university education! In *The Reformed Pastor* I have found citations from nearly seventy authors (some of them quoted many times) extending from the early Fathers to writers of his own day. In view of Baxter's own designs for Church unity, it is not surprising to find that, of his contemporaries, pride of place is given to Archbishop Usher, "a most learned, orthodox, and godly man," p. 443.

[3] *Vide* Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, Introduction.

find the richest possible incentive to all that is best and highest in his vocation, whatever may be the width of his differences from Baxter the Theologian."[1]

THOMAS WOOD.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. H. E. W. Turner, B.D., is Fellow and Chaplain of Lincoln College, Oxford.

Herr Erich Müller is a literary critic, who is living in the Russian Zone of Germany.

The Rev. John Coutts is assistant curate of St Peter's Church, Bournemouth.

The Rev. Thomas Wood is assistant curate of Mansfield Parish Church.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Since Mr Kemp in his comments on Professor Ramsey's article devotes some attention to my *Theology Occasional Paper,* I hope your space may allow me to acknowledge his kindness in singling me out for notice. I hope, however, that I may be excused from replying to his iterated suggestion that "it seems odd" that I should have written that essay, since in matters of historical argument I regard evidence as preferable to insinuation.

First, I refrained in my Paper, with two small exceptions, from adducing evidence from unprinted sources, and wholly omitted evidence from foreign manuscript archives, since it seemed to me impossible within the limits of that essay to offer the *pièces justificatives* necessary to enable readers to satisfy themselves of the authenticity and representative nature of such citations. Therefore the great majority of my quotations were taken from printed and readily-accessible sources, and smacked of plagiarism in consequence. Perhaps some future occasion will offer for the fuller presentation of this further evidence, which is neither inconsiderable nor unimportant.

Secondly, as stated in my Paper, my citations could have been greatly expanded and extended, if all seventeenth-century writers had been mentioned. Such extension, of course, would include not only those who took a rigid view of episcopacy, but also those who regarded church polity as a thing indifferent, yet, notwithstanding, being bishops and presbyters, would have their just place as representing an element in the Anglican tradition of that century.

Thirdly, all selections are by their nature selective, and the vital question is whether any selection is representative. I included citations from Andrewes, Laud, Bramhall, Taylor, Thorndike, Gunning, Cosin, Ussher, Sharp, and Wake (the list is not complete), whom I believe to be representative Caroline high-churchmen. Mr

[1] *A Life,* etc., p. 9.

Kemp mentions the name of Pearson (without citation) and the lower house of Canterbury Convocation of 1689. Since he offers no citations from Pearson, there is no occasion for comment. With regard to the Comprehension proposals of the latter half of the seventeenth century, they concerned primarily and predominantly the Dissenters in England, and where the foreign non-episcopal churches were mentioned, as in 1689, they came in secondarily and circumferentially. If, however, Mr Kemp wishes to initiate a full and detailed discussion of the projected Comprehension of 1688-89, I should be willing to participate.

Fourthly, the question at issue is: not whether the Anglican tradition requires episcopacy where it can be had, and as the indispensable basis of corporate reunion (for this was the argument of my Paper), but whether representative Caroline divines regarded the foreign non-episcopal churches as lacking the essentials of a church, ministry, and sacraments; and whether the Tractarians adopted a more rigid view of episcopacy than these Caroline divines. Would the divines from whom I offered citations have subscribed to the statement concerning episcopal ordination of Tract 1: "We must necessarily consider none to be *really* ordained, who have not *thus* been ordained"? Would they not rather have concurred cordially with the title of Tract 4: "Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the Safest Course"?

Finally, may I venture to reaffirm my own conclusions in the succinct and authoritative words of Dr Claude Jenkins: "It seems to me impossible to deny that the English bishops recognized the foreign Churches as Churches. 'We may be and are,' said Laud, 'of the same religion, and yet "agree" not with them in those opinions in which we differ from them.' It seems to me equally impossible to deny that there are probably isolated cases of men not episcopally ordained having ministered in the Church of England. But it is not merely probable, it is certain that such cases indicate no weakening at any time of the Anglican view of the ministry contained in the Ordinal, nor of what was requisite in England."

Yours sincerely,
NORMAN SYKES.

EMMANUEL COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.
January 1st, 1949.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANT CURATES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

To adapt the last words of your December editorial, what the Archdeacon of York says is being carefully pondered in theological colleges and by ordination candidates. Of the eleven of us from my college made deacon at Trinity, 1948, eight went to the Northern Province. Of these six went to Durham, Sheffield, or Manchester dioceses, among those which the Archdeacon of York's statistics

suggest to be most in need. Lest I should be convicted of claiming special insight for myself and my colleagues, may I be allowed to sign myself,

Your obedient servant,
A DEACON.

December 1st, 1948.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I have no desire to cross swords with the Archdeacon of York, whose admirable article in your December issue I read with much pleasure.

But there is a point in this rather ancient controversy about the claims of North and South in the matter of curacies which has to my mind never received the attention it ought to have. *Why does the North of England produce so few ordination candidates?*

It so happens that my ministry of nearly forty-three years has been divided about equally between the North and the South with some years spent in Birmingham, which is a halfway house. It is in my experience a very rare thing in the North for a parish to produce an ordination candidate, whereas in the South it is more common. I cannot recollect any of the Northern parishes with which I was associated producing one, whereas from my London parish there have come ten young men now in the ranks of the priesthood, all doing excellent work, and some more under training. And on making inquiries among friends I find that my experience is by no means unusual.

It is very easy to gibe at the unwillingness of the Southerner to come North, but the truth is that not all of them are suitable for the sort of work which has to be done in this part of England, any more than some Northerners are fitted for the South. And we have to beware lest, swayed unduly by religious emotion, we proceed to plant more square pegs in round holes.

I wish the Archdeacon would continue his investigations and discover how many ordination candidates come from the North and how many from the South. I think it would probably surprise us all. And it might lead to the dioceses of the Province of York trying to supply their own needs and not depending, as I think they do now, on Canterbury filling up the gaps. And I am sure that direction of labour will not help us. It is more likely to dry up the very thin supply that exists. Let us keep a little of the Parson's Freehold.

I am,
Yours very truly,
G. BIRCHENOUGH.

P.S.—We have three Canons at our Cathedral. Not one is a Northerner by birth. There are four Minor Canons. The same is true of them. I am the only Northerner by birth.

THE DEANERY,
RIPON.
December 6th, 1948.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM. By W. F. Flemington. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

Mr Flemington's study may with justice be characterized as "detailed and scholarly," but it is perhaps more painstaking than original. Nevertheless, it is to be recommended, for his discussion of the origins of Christian baptism and of its dominical authority are both lucid and exhaustive. There are, further, significant and timely emphasis: thus his insistence is most valuable on the universal agreement of the New Testament writers upon the meaning of Baptism as a concrete embodiment of the Apostolic preaching, symbolizing the Gospel of the Resurrection. Equally notable is his convincing argument that Jesus was the first to make the connexion between Baptism and His death, a relationship frequently, and one may now say wrongly, dismissed as either a literary device or a "Pauline" creation.

There are, however, certain statements which should not be allowed to pass without question. Mr Flemington's contention that the preaching of the Baptist contained no reference to the Spirit seems difficult to maintain in view of his admission that the rite was eschatological, for as Schweitzer has reasonably suggested, such a baptism would be regarded as an external sign, of which the "mark upon the forehead" of Ezekiel ix is an early example, by which those who accepted it would share in the outpouring of the Spirit preceding the Final Judgment. (*The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 1910, p. 376.) Again, Mr Flemington, in rejecting the Matthean Baptismal command, bases part of his argument on the later Gentile controversy which, according to him, would not have taken place had there been any explicit guidance of Jesus; but that dispute was not whether Gentiles should be allowed admission at all, but on what terms they were to be granted admission (cf. J. Lowe, "Jesus and the Gentiles," *Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies*, 11).

While Mr Flemington's outline of the doctrine in the epistles is to be commended, his treatment of the accounts in Acts is less satisfactory. Although this is in part due to the nature of the evidence, yet his failure to define the significance of the "laying on of hands" confuses his exposition. Here he is perhaps guilty of some contradictions, for having quoted with approval Dr New's statement that "Belief in Jesus (or in His name), baptism, the remission of sins, the laying on of Apostolic hands, and the reception of the Spirit seem to have formed a single complex of associated ideas, any one of which might in any single narrative be either omitted or emphasized" (p. 38), he assumes that the laying on of hands can have formed no part of the rite in Acts ii, 38, and asserts that there is no direct evidence, "save in one or two passages, for the existence of any such additional rite [corresponding to confirmation] during the New Testament period" (p. 149), while elsewhere admitting that "the laying on of hands was at a quite early period associated with

Christian baptism" (p. 98). While it would be unfair to criticize Mr Flemington for not considering the relationship of baptism to confirmation (apart from a lengthy footnote and a brief appendix, all too brief to allow of any weighty contribution), since that is not the purpose of his study, yet recognition of the problem affects the interpretation of the New Testament doctrine (*e.g.*, John iii, 5; 1 Cor. x. 1-4). However, although Mr Flemington has nothing to add to the Anglican debate, yet his study provides a useful survey of the meaning of Christian initiation as a unity, a summary which is of interest to all Christians no matter what their denomination.

The University, Birmingham.. J. G. Davies.

Eucharistic Consecration in the Primitive Church. By G. A. Michell. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This short essay of thirty-odd pages bears an importance out of all proportion to its length. It is an attempt to approach the problem of the duality underlying the early Eucharistic tradition from a new angle. It does not call in supposed differences between Pauline and non-Pauline Christianity to explain it. But it explores the Jewish tradition out of which Christianity itself arose, and claims to have discovered there a duality not of practice but of interpretation.

In Part I the thesis is put forward that in addition to the Rabbinic view that the efficacy of Jewish blessings (*berakoth*) depended upon the use of the Divine Name in their first clause, there existed another and older view, attested by 1 Timothy iv, 4-5, according to which *berakoth* owed their efficacy to a word of creation or divine command contained in their second clause.

In Part II these two divergent theories are used as a clue to explain the striking differences in early Christian "prayers of consecration." From the evidence of St Justin and St Hippolytus the conclusion is drawn that the prayers with which they were familiar were inspired by the older or New Testament theory of consecration, and implied that this was effected by a series of Christological thanksgivings. In Gnostic circles, on the other hand, the Rabbinic theory of consecration is already discernible in the second century *Acts of John*, which regard consecration as accomplished by a "putting on" of the Divine Name. The first clause of the *berakah* is enlarged, and the second is atrophied. The "prayer of consecration" has in fact ceased to be an *Eucharistia* and has become an *Epiclesis*. Nor was it only in Gnostic circles that a "Name" theory of consecration obtained. The orthodox Clement of Alexandria agrees with the heretical Theodotus on this point, and the liturgical tradition underlying the Prayer Book of St Sarapion of Thmuis is based upon it. The Syrian tradition is then shown to agree with the Egyptian in the admission of the Rabbinic theory. Dr Michell accepts Professor Ratcliff's reconstruction of the original *anaphora* of the *Liturgy of Addai and Mari* in preference to that proposed by Dom Dix, and sees in it an ancient *Eucharistia* somewhat affected by the "Name"

theology; while from the Syriac *Acts of Thomas* he quotes a prayer from which all Christological thanksgivings are absent. Here is another illustration of the thesis that the acceptance of the "Name" theory sooner or later changes an *Eucharistia* into an *Epiclesis*.

In the fourth century the development of Trinitarian theology inevitably caused some modification in the "Name" tradition. The intention of prayers, which "put on" or invoked the Name of God, had been to call down Divine Power upon the elements. But when the exercise of Divine Power in sanctifying persons and things came to be recognized as a function of the Third Person of the Trinity, the practice of invoking the "Name" was superseded by invocations of the Spirit. Theodotus had held that the elements were sanctified and changed by the Power of the Name of God. Now St Cyril of Jerusalem teaches that "whatsoever the Holy Spirit has touched is sanctified and changed," and his *Catecheses* are the first clear attestation of a liturgy which embodied this belief.

In the West liturgical development followed an entirely different course. The "Name" theory was not adopted, but the idea that consecration was effected by Christological thanksgivings was forgotten. This led to the acceptance of the "Words" theory of consecration and the insertion into the prayer of petitions that God would ratify what was done in obedience to the divine command, a notion comparable to that of the second clause of the *berekah*. The essay ends by pointing to the connexion between conversion doctrines of the Eucharistic Presence and "prayers of consecration" of the Epicletic type.

In the opinion of the reviewer Dr Michell has made his case. And he has brought out an *articulus separationis* between Catholic and heretic. In the one tradition the sacrifice is offered—and the elements are therefore Body and Blood—by *Eucharistia*; and the Name of God is thereby *glorified*, in accordance with the prophecy of Malachi. In the other the sacrifice is offered—and the elements are therefore charged with, or changed into, supernatural Power—by *Epiclesis*; and the Name of God is *used* to effect this conversion. (The quotations from Origen on p. 20 are illuminating.) Apart from its main thesis the essay abounds in interesting suggestions. It is to be hoped that Dr Michell will follow some of them up in subsequent essays. He is clearly right in maintaining that the *Te Deum laudamus* is modelled on the Eucharistic prayer. The form of the *Sanctus* would seem to guarantee this. Not all his readers will be able to accept the text of the Hippolytan *anaphora*, given on pp. 13-14, as in all particulars the prayer which the author of the *Apostolic Tradition* composed. And some will wonder why if St Cyprian consecrated with the Words of Institution, he refrained from strengthening the argument of Epistle 63 by saying so. But these are minor points of difference. The only real complaint that can be made against the essay is that it is far too short.

Footnote 43 should read Adversus Marcionem 4, 40.

St Stephen's House, Oxford. A. H. Couratin.

Our Trespasses. By M. Jarrett-Kerr. S.C.M. Press. 6s.
Revelation and Evangelism. By F. W. Dillistone. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

It is a healthy occupation to consider in the light of first principles something we commonly take for granted. It becomes imperative to do so when what was once the spontaneous expression of inner conviction is attacked as mischievous, or dismissed as pointless. Both books under review seek to examine the theological basis of matters which the majority of Christians regard as self-evident, but which the majority of the rest either deplore or ignore.

Our Trespasses sets out to "help ordinary intelligent people to find out what a sense of sin really means, and what should be done about it." It is not given to everyone to make sin an attractive subject, but the author sets about what could be a bleak and repellent task in a style that is stimulating, even effervescent. At the same time his treatment is never superficial. He dodges nothing and minimizes nothing. His introductory chapter on the various devices for getting round sin is penetrating and timely. His examination, conducted in the light of illustrations drawn from modern novels and plays, of what "we mean by the 'sin' we try to dodge," points to the fact that sin, together with the desire to be rid of it, is deeply embedded in the world. The book goes on to deal with "how God designed to rid us of it" and, after a brief consideration of the Fall, Redemption, and Forgiveness, considers methods of repentance. The writer is as sane and frank about confession as he is about that other unpopular topic, Hell. The last chapter, which sets out "to see the spiritual life as a shared thing, not a selfish pursuit, and apply this to sin and repentance," is perhaps the most valuable in the book.

The author's refreshingly clear thought does not always find lucid expression. It is occasionally necessary to return to disentangle a paragraph. Sometimes it is difficult to remember to whom the book is addressed—and still more difficult to believe that it will find its way into their hands. If it does, it will not fail in its purpose.

Revelation and Evangelism, on the other hand, is a concise and forthright statement on the theology of evangelism, addressed directly to churchmen. It makes no heavy demands on overburdened time or slender purse. Nevertheless it is of weight disproportionate to its size, a masterly exposition as carefully composed as a good design.

Professor Dillistone reminds us that until recently the missionary movement was "spontaneous and dynamic, and its basic presuppositions . . . largely unquestioned." Now the Church is challenged to state "her position in regard both to the theory and the practice of missionary enterprises."

The writer examines criticisms from without the Church, and the cleavage of opinion within He sets up no Aunt Sallys, but reviews four weighty criticisms, two from men of "acute philosophical thinking," B. K. Mallek and Sir Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, and two from

men of "more popular gifts," Lin Yutang and Dr Krishnalal Shridharani. The book then points to the uncertainty within the Church, as expressed in the biography of the Methodist Bishop Fisher, as well as in statements by the Bishop of Chichester, by Dr James Parkes (THEOLOGY, October, 1944), and by Professor W. E. Hocking.

Chapter Three passes to the consideration of representative writers of modern Western Christendom: Maritain, Barth, Farmer, and Brunner.

In Chapter Four the book leaps forward into enthusiastic life. In his review of "The Biblical Witness to Revelation," the writer sees a clearly defined missionary pattern of "Election—Witness—Suffering—Blessing," and stresses the importance of the essential *form* as "livingly revealed" in the Bible, as well as of the *content* of the Word.

Finally, Professor Dillistone outlines an approach to Revelation related to the missionary task: "Only through a life-pattern, which is expanding and out-reaching and self-identifying—in other words a missionary life—can God's revelation be truly expressed." It was "brought to its intensest expression . . . when the pattern was revealed in the Son."

EDWIN S. URWIN.

LIVERPOOL.

SEED OF ADAM AND OTHER PLAYS. By Charles Williams. With an Introduction by Anne Ridler. Oxford. 6s.

ARTHURIAN TORSO containing the posthumous fragment of The Figure of Arthur by Charles Williams and a Commentary on the Arthurian Poems of Charles Williams by C. S. Lewis. Oxford. 12s. 6d.

The fashionable stage success in Paris as I write is *Etat de Siège* by Albert Camus, the author of the novel recently translated by Mr Stuart Gilbert as *The Plague*. At thirty-five Camus is famous, and that makes me think of Charles Williams, who cannot be said to have entered upon even posthumous fame—yet. In *Etat de Siège* we have the same bold novelty of symbolical character as William surprised and delighted the elect among us with in *Cranmer*, *Seed of Adam*, and *The House of the Octopus*, and the same absence of the normal dramatist's "sense of the theatre" and stage devices. Unlike Camus, Williams wrote religious plays. But it cannot be simply because *Seed of Adam* is a nativity and the other three pieces in the first of the above-named volumes are Christmas plays that their appeal has been limited. There is in them a certain fantastic quality of thought and a certain extravagance of language that were natural to their author, but that may be disconcerting to their audiences. Yet the vicar or other pastor who will persuade some of his flock to produce *Seed of Adam* or one of the other three little plays at the appropriate season is likely to find that the result rewards the effort. Williams, in his wildest flights, is always in pursuit of orthodoxy.

Moreover, such plays are limpid in comparison with the poetry

that has led to the publication of our second volume, *Arthurian Torso*. Of all Williams wrote the work nearest his heart was the cycle of Arthurian poems of which he had issued a first volume, *Taliessin in Logres* (Oxford), in 1938, and a second, *The Region of the Summer Stars* (Poetry London), in 1944. For their appreciation a reader must bring with him more than goodwill, and many are likely to be grateful to Mr Lewis for his commentary. As one who had "heard nearly all [of the cycle] read aloud and expounded by the author and had questioned him closely on his meaning," he is probably the person who was best qualified to produce it.

That does not mean, however, that everybody will agree with everything he says. His discussion of obscurity, at any rate, is not altogether happy. For instance, it is not, as he alleges, Mr T. S. Eliot (*The Waste Land*) who assumes in his readers "a knowledge of the Tarot pack"; it is Williams (*The Greater Trumps*). Mr Eliot says, on the contrary, that he has not this knowledge himself. More generally, Mr Lewis seems to think that a poet is open to reproach if his work is not immediately intelligible to any chance visitor to a bookshop. But surely a poet is under no more obligation in that respect than the author of *Functions of a Complex Variable?* Surely he is free to select the readers he pleases?

The Figure of Arthur is the title of an unfinished book about the legend of Arthur and the Grail myth on which Williams was engaged at his death. The five completed chapters which Mr Lewis places before his own commentary on the Arthurian poems may not do much to elucidate these in detail. But, in common with much else by Williams, they are full of an interest superficially perverse. Chrestien de Troyes is treated in them as the original expositor of courtly love, whereas in the latest book on the subject—*La Joie d'Amour* by Pierre Belperron,[1] a member of the Paris publishing house of Plon and author of an earlier study of the Albigenses—it is said that Chrestien did but denature a doctrine put forward in its purity by earlier writers. Again, is not Chrestien's story of Perceval, the Fisher King, and the Dolorous Blow, simply ruined by Williams's attempt to interpret it? And the five chapters leave us tantalized regarding why Williams imagined that the story of Galahad and his achievement of the Grail is not only obvious material for poetry, but also some peculiar aid to holding the Christian faith.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

PETERBOROUGH.

RELIGION. By Nathaniel Micklem. Geoffrey Cumberlege: Oxford University Press (H.U.L.). 5s.

For many years past the *Home University Library* has provided a series of authoritative introductions to the arts and sciences; and, as long as it is remembered that the volumes profess to be no more than introductions, Dr Micklem's recent contribution is a useful successor in the small theological section to the late Dr Estlin

[1] Paris: Plon, 1948.

Carpenter's *Comparative Religion*, first published in 1913. The reader is given a certain amount of data which has come to light since then, but one regrets the absence of reference to many contemporary scholars—*e.g.*, Karsten on animism, and E. O. James on sacrifice, to quote but two instances. There is nothing startlingly new in the book, but the author's presentation of religion as a world-wide phenomenon is lucid and attractive. Clearly so vast a topic can be approached from many angles. Dr Micklem's method has been to select some of the main types of religion, and consider the founders or outstanding movements of each. Thus, under the chapter headed "The Most High God," treating of monotheism, he has short sections on Zoroaster, Ikhnaton, St Bonaventura, Spinoza, and Natural Theology; while under that entitled "The Way of Personal Devotion" he sketches very briefly Mahayana Buddhism, Indian *bhakti* and its Christian equivalent, the Shiites of Islam, the messianic hope in Israel, and Plato. An obvious criticism is that the 200 pages are extremely discursive, but this is inevitable with so broad a subject.

The value of the book lies not only in the fact that it is a mine of information, but perhaps even more in the fact that it reminds the Christian that he cannot, in his unending quest for the truth, ignore the whole range of human religious experience, as if it had no significance for him. This there has been a tendency among some theologians to do latterly, and one suspects that often it arises from a secret refusal to face the awkward problems raised by the scientific study of religion. Possibly such embarrassment accounts for the absence of comparative theology (a better term than the meaningless "comparative religion") in the curricula of ordinands, and the consequent ignorance of the clergy generally not only of non-Christian religions but also of other varieties of their own. For this reason alone many a parson's library might benefit by the addition of this slim but easy-to-read volume.

Dr Micklem does not intend to prove anything here of the truth of religion. He is content to paint a picture of religion as it has been and is in all its diversity. Nevertheless, he claims that this picture shows Christianity to satisfy the desires inherent in most systems: "Christian theology moves between two poles, Creation and Redemption, corresponding roughly to the religions of Reason and the religions of Revelation . . . the Christian religion may be said to be the consummation or 'crown' of a very large part of human religion generally." Dr Micklem keeps good company: Paul, Clement of Alexandria, and Aquinas said much the same long ago. But academic discussion about religion is one thing: religion itself another. Wisely he concludes, "The arguments of philosophy are different from the arguments of religion . . . no man will accept the Christian faith or any other, or be a religious man, apart from some inward touch of the heavenly fire at once incommunicable to others and self-evidencing to him."

D. W. Gundry.

University College of North Wales,
Bangor.

THE PHOTIAN SCHISM: HISTORY AND LEGEND. By Francis Dvornik. Cambridge University Press. 35s.

This large and expensive book is an essential adjunct to the library of any theological college, and a valuable addition to any collection of books bearing on Christian reunion. The first part is a detailed study, by the foremost authority on the subject, of the relations between Rome and Constantinople between A.D. 843 and 906 in the age of the first appearance of the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals. The outcome of this is an historical revision that illuminates the real character of the conflict between the Patriarch Photius, whose encyclopædic scholarship has provided so much of our information about lost Greek classics, and his "extremist" opponents. Dr Dvornik, himself a Roman Catholic priest, reveals the accidental character of the alliance between the Byzantine ascetic extremists and two particular Popes, who were for other reasons at odds with Photius. The extremists refused to accept Roman decisions when given against them, and in the tenth and following centuries were generally found in inflexible opposition to any détente with Rome.

The second part of the book deals with the growth of the received version of the story, first of all in the Latin West, where canonists in the Investiture controversy claimed Œcumenical authority for the council against Photius in Constantinople in 869-70, though they retained in their collections canons from the "Photian" councils against Ignatius in 861 and 879-80, including one that cancelled the proceedings of the so-called Eighth Œcumenical Council. This is in the *Decretum* of Ivo of Chartres, but not, for obvious reasons, in Gratian, whose *Concordia Discordantium Canonum* was intended to cut such Gordian knots as had troubled earlier canonists. A little later the brothers Leo and Hugh Tuscus brought back from Constantinople the "anti-Photianist collection," compiled by extreme adversaries of the Patriarch, and used it to explain away the council of 879-80, where in the Byzantine view the legates of Pope John VIII had not only cancelled previous councils, but anathematized the *filioque*. (While Dr Dvornik holds that the Greek acts of this council truly represent the course of the proceedings, he thinks the sixth session less decisive in its anathema on additions to the creed than controversialists on either side have generally supposed.) The Greeks in their turn gradually came to claim for *this* Eighth Council an Œcumenical authority. But in their tradition in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries only seven Œcumenical councils are acknowledged.

Doubts about either Eighth Council were still felt at Florence in 1438-9. Recent research by Roman Catholic scholars since this book was written supports the view that in their enumeration the Florentine fathers omitted both, as also the intermediate assemblies held in Western Christendom from the Lateran councils to Basle, and called themselves the "Eighth Œcumenical." It may be that as they ignored the abortive council for union at Lyons in 1274, some future council may pass over their unsuccessful efforts. The real Eighth Œcumenical Council may still meet.

Some remarks on pp. 326-8 and 355-6 on the circumstances in which the Popes dropped their "pious custom" of making a profession of faith that served as a "systatic letter" to the other Patriarchs are worth careful reading.

George Every, S.S.M.
Kelham.

Das Schöne als Weltanschauung. By J. Staudinger, S.J. Verlag Herder. Vienna. 1948.

The author sets out to analyse the nature of beauty, especially in the light of Plato and Augustine, but more, as it turns out, in the light of Augustine and of medieval theological conceptions. What he gives is not an æsthetic, or a philosophy, but a theology of beauty. He sets beauty (defined by conflating the two classical descriptions of "what pleases" and what has "a certain plenitude of being") in direct relation and subordination to God, as participating in His being. "So it is then with all creaturely beauty. It rests not on itself but is the outpouring from the sea of God's infinite beauty, the reflection of His infinite perfection, the footprint of His being." In relation to God everything is beautiful (*e.g.*, corruption, which is ugly to man, is enjoyed by the worm, the birds enjoy the worm, and men enjoy the colours and song of the birds . . .); beauty is thus seen as an ontic rather than an æsthetic problem. Similarly the nature of human perception of the beautiful is discussed in terms of man's being, his creatureliness, his limitation to the senses, and by sin, and his individual limitations. The argument is reiterated when the beautiful is identified with the holy in a neat formula: "So far as any creaturely being is in relation with God, it is beautiful, and it is beautiful in virtue of its relation with God—that is, in virtue of its being holy. The limits of its relation with God are also the limits of its being; for in God alone does it have its source and from Him and to Him there flows everything, without exception, which it contains in itself. Thus every creaturely being is completely beautiful as it is also completely holy, for it is completely grounded in God and comes from Him: from God, in God, for God." The book, which abounds in fine writing, closes with a notable peroration in praise of the beauty of redemption and the consummation of all beauty in Christ: "In Christ those streams in which the divine life rolls over time and eternities flood to their height; in Him those suns, from which light breaks forth for the establishing of all creaturely being blaze up; He embraces the cosmos with the strong arm of His almighty power and embraces it again with the bloody arms of His love, broken on the Cross. . . . He is the great homecoming of the beautiful to God. . . ."

But it must be said that in his whole approach the author is not concerned with concrete examination of his theme in particular examples of beauty. He has really set out to show how we may understand God as Beauty. Within his theological presuppositions he has made a brilliant flight. The obscure problem of the dependence of the created world upon God, and its relative inde

pendence from Him as seen especially in the "creation" of beautiful things by men, is untouched. Put another way, the achievement of the Renaissance, seen as more than "pride," seen as a contribution to this problem, is ignored. The merits of this book, which are considerable, cannot cover its limitations: what is needed is a proper metaphysic of beauty rather than a theological exploitation of it.

R. Gregor Smith.

London.

The Rôle of Women in the Church. By C. M. Ady. Press and Publications Board. 7s. 6d.

This book should challenge young church women who are considering their vocation. Dr Ady makes it clear that the Church needs them and why. Her purpose is to show the many opportunities for service opening to church women today. Dr Ady complains with truth that, compared with the work of women in the mission field, little is known about women's church work in England. This may be, however, an indication of the healthy state of the work and of those who accomplish it.

Dr Ady traces the development of women's work in the Church today to the Women's Movement which began with the nineteenth-century pioneers. In an interesting survey of the rôle of women in the past, she points out that up to the time of the Reformation the Church made full use of consecrated service and accorded to women a position of honour and dignity. This is only now being recovered.

The activities of the three classes of women workers—*i.e.*, "professed" and "ordained," professional, and voluntary—are shown to be complementary, the one essential qualification being a sound knowledge of the Christian faith. The six chapters devoted to the scope and variety of the work, two of which are contributed by specialists, show the immense field covered by the phrase "church work." In education and social work, whether organized by Church or State, as well as in parish and diocese, the Church is calling for the services of Christian women. In discussing parish work, Dr Ady emphasizes the importance of the new housing areas. "It may be that future generations will judge the Church of this age by its ability to establish itself firmly in these new districts. If so, the value of women workers will be appraised in the light of their effectiveness in a sphere which is at once the Church's most formidable problem and its greatest opportunity."

Finally, the opportunities for training are reviewed, and the Church is shown to be wide awake to its importance. Even the voluntary worker must be trained, and for all alike the emphasis is on theological training. "It is with some insight into the needs of the times that those concerned with the recruiting of women for the Church place the study of theology in the forefront of their training schemes."

Dr Ady writes with insight and understanding of the problems connected with women's work, and the book vibrates with a sense of

the urgency of the need. It is a pity that it costs 7s. 6d. and that the type is discouragingly small. But the book speaks. May it be heard by many!

MARIANNE TURNER.

WILLIAM TEMPLE COLLEGE,
HAWARDEN.

SHORTER NOTICE

CHRISTIANITY TODAY: A SURVEY OF THE STATE OF THE CHURCHES. Edited by Henry Smith Leiper. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

The Archbishop of Canterbury contributes a Foreword to this survey of the present state of the non-Roman churches throughout the world. It has been prepared under American auspices. A strong team of well-informed writers in all countries has provided the necessary information. Special attention is given to the way in which the various churches were affected by the war.

A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

S.P.C.K.: H. Scott Holland, *How to Read the Synoptic Gospels* (9d.); D. Flower and E. Yeo, *The Army of the King* (2s.); G. L. Prestige, *The Soul of a Prophet* (1s.); *Lambeth Conference 1948 (Encyclical Letter and Resolutions)* (1s.); J. Biddell, *Invitation to Dance; Masque of the Kings* (3s. 6d.); J. Powell, *The Fare to Tarshish* (1s. 6d.); Various, *Six Short Religious Plays* (4s.); Dudley Symon, *Lambeth Questions* (2s.); Iwa Langentels, *The Castle of Perseverance* (2s. 9d.); A. F. Smethurst and H. R. Wilson, *Acts of the Convocation of Canterbury and York since 1921* (7s. 6d.); M. R. Newbolt, *The Christian Virtues: Faith, Hope and Charity* (6d.); Edward Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Times* (30s.); Bishop of Winchester, *An Introduction to the Amended Lectionary for Sundays and Certain Holy Days* (Ed. 1947-8) (3d.).

STAPLES PRESS: G. Wilson Knight, *Christ and Nietzsche* (15s.).

LA TABLE RONDE (PARIS): Jean Daniélou, *Origène* (n.p.).

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON PRESS: Sir Fred Clarke, *Freedom in the Educative Society* (4s. 6d.).

VERLAG HERDER (VIENNA): J. A. Jungmann, S.J., *Missarum Sollemnia* (Schilling 142.0).

WOODCOMBE FARMHOUSE (MINEHEAD): S. P. T. Prideaux, *The Story of St. Boniface Missionary College, Warminster* (9s. 6d.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZÜRICH): Roger Ley, *Kirchenzucht bei Zwingli* (Fr. 9.00); J. Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte* (Fr. 7.00); W. G. Kümmel, *Das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament* (Fr. 5.50); A. Bentzen, *Messias Moses redivivus Menschensohn* (Fr. 7.00); D. Lerch, *Das Problem der Toleranz in theologischer Sicht* (Fr. 1.80); R. Pfister, *Zwingli, Hauptschriften Band I* (Fr. 12.00); W. Michaelis, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (1-7) (Fr. 11.50); Emil Brunner, *Kommunismus, Kapitalismus und Christentum* (Fr. 2.50).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher

HEFFER
OF
CAMBRIDGE
will pay good prices for

THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

especially the following:

St Augustine's Works, sets
Calvin's Works, in English
Century Bible, sets
Duchesne. History of the Church, 3 vols.
Grimm-Thayer. Lexicon to New Testament Greek
Gwatkin. Early Church History, 2 vols.
do. Knowledge of God, 2 vols.
Hastings. Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics
do. Dictionary of the Bible
Hatch and Redpath. Concordance to Septuagint
Harnack. History of Dogma
Henry Bradshaw Society Publications
International Critical Commentaries, any vols.
Lightfoot. Commentaries on the Epistles
Moffatt Commentaries, any vols.
Stephens and Hunt. History of the Christian Church
Gore's Commentary
Peake's Commentary
Swete. St Mark
do. Apocalypse
Westcott. St John's Gospel
do. Epistles

and for standard books on any subject

W. HEFFER & SONS LIMITED
PETTY CURY
CAMBRIDGE

Ready Shortly

France Pagan?

The Mission of Abbé Godin

By Maisie Ward **10/6 net**

The whole Catholic world is watching the Mission de Paris and the related movements aimed to bridge the gap between the Church and so many millions of the French working class. Great experiments are being tried, some wise, some perhaps less wise. They add up to a huge pioneering work and, in the phrase of Cardinal Suhard, "pioneers must not be blamed for making mistakes."

To make a survey and a provisional evaluation of the movement, Maisie Ward has produced the present book.

Dante the Philosopher

By Etienne Gilson **15/- net**

M. Gilson seeks to understand and interpret Dante's own thought—not to classify him as belonging to some particular school. Dante emerges from this study neither as the poetic replica of St Thomas which he is sometimes assumed to be nor, on the other hand, as at heart a heretic.

SHEED & WARD, LTD.

110-111 FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT

By C. B. MOSS, D.D. 15s.

We are in full communion with the Old Catholic Churches and a full account of the origin and development of these Churches is urgently needed. This book fulfils the need and, using original sources, traces the history of the Old Catholic Churches. A very readable work of scholarship.

THE REFORMATION IN DENMARK

By E. H. DUNKLEY, D.D. 13s. 6d.

There has been a tendency to neglect the Church History of the north of Europe. Dr Dunkley has righted this omission by providing a detailed and readable history of the Reformation in Denmark. He traces the history of the Danish Reformation from the beginning of Christian II's reign in 1513 to the end of the reign of Christian III in 1559.

(*Published for the Church Historical Society*)

THE ROYAL PEARL

The Life and Times of Margaret Queen of Scotland

By A. M. D. HENDERSON-HOWAT 10s. 6d.

The life of St Margaret, and the age in which she lived, is a worthy subject for the pen of a biographer. Mrs Henderson-Howat combines the research of the scholar with the imaginative insight of the novelist, and the result is a ray of light shed on a personality all too little known.

THE REVISION OF THE PSALTER

By HAROLD RILEY 8s. 6d.

This book points the way to the revision of the English Psalter that is so badly needed, and also to a more serviceable arrangement of the psalms for Sunday, daily and occasional use than is now provided.

THE FUTURE OF ANGLICANISM

By A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D., Bishop of Derby 6d.

A lecture delivered on the Charles Gore Memorial Foundation on November 12, 1948, in Westminster Abbey.

S·P·C·K

Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2